

AD-A284 590



A Survey of the Roles and Functions
of Armed Forces Radio and Television Service

By

Thomas D. McCollum



This document has been approved
for public release and its
distribution is unlimited.

THIS THESIS WAS ACCEPTED ON Nov. 4 1993
Month Day Year

as meeting the research requirement for the master's degree.

Adviser Harold C. Shaver
Department of

Leonard J. Deutch
Dean of Graduate School

94-20844



DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 5

94 7 8 001

**A Survey of the Roles and Functions
of Armed Forces Radio and Television Service**

**By
Thomas D. McCollum**

Accession For	
NTIS CRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By <i>per lti</i>	
Distribution	
Availability Codes	
Dist	
A-1	

**A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Journalism
Marshall University
November, 1993**

Table of Contents

	Page
List of tables.....	iv
Acknowledgments.....	vi
Chapter	
1. Introduction.....	1
Significance of the study... ..	1
Statement of the problem.....	1
Purpose.....	2
Hypotheses.....	3
Assumptions and limitations.....	4
2. Background of the study.....	5
Review of literature.....	5
3. Methodology.....	11
Sources of data.....	11
Research instruments.....	13
Treatment of data.....	14
4. Results.....	15
Demographics:	
Commanders overseas.....	16
Production personnel.....	20

**AFRTS and the Command Information
system:**

Commanders overseas..... 21

Production personnel..... 24

Comparison between commanders and
producers..... 26

AFRTS and the Host Nation:

Commanders overseas..... 28

Production personnel..... 30

Comparison between commanders and
producers..... 32

Accuracy of AFRTS:

Commanders overseas..... 34

Production personnel..... 35

Comparison between commanders and
producers..... 36

Commanders' sources of news..... 38

4. Discussion..... 39

Appendixes

A. Commanders' survey..... 47

B. Producers' survey..... 54

C. Cover letter for surveys..... 59

D. Notice card..... 60

E. Reminder card..... 61

F.	Commanders' sources of news data.....	62
G.	Commanders' comments about the questionnaire.....	64
H.	Producers' comments about the questionnaire.....	69
	Works Cited.....	72

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1a. Demographics of commanders in Germany.....	17
1b. Demographics of commanders in Japan.....	18
1c. Demographics of commanders in Korea.....	19
1d. Demographics of commanders in Panama/Honduras.....	19
2a. Commanders' views of AFRTS's effects on command information.....	21
2b. Country of commander in relation to views on AFRTS's effects on a unit's mission.....	23
2c. Producers' views of AFRTS's effects on command information.....	25
2d. Comparison of commanders and producers on the effectiveness of AFRTS and the command information system.....	27
2e. Correlation between commanders' and producers' responses to AFRTS's effects on the command information system.....	28

3a.	Commanders' views of AFRTS and the host nation.....	29
3b.	Producers' views of AFRTS and the host nation.....	31
3c.	Comparison of commanders and production personnel's on the effectiveness of AFRTS and the host nation.....	32
3d.	Correlation between commanders' and producers' responses to AFRTS's effects on the host nation.....	34
4a.	Commanders' views on the accuracy of AFRTS.....	34
4b.	Producers' views on the accuracy of AFRTS.....	36
4c.	Comparison of commanders and producers' on the accuracy of AFRTS.....	37
4d.	Correlation between commanders' and producers' responses to the accuracy of AFRTS.....	38
5.	AFRTS-generated news is biased in Favor of the U.S. military, Government and Host Nation.....	44

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people had a part in helping me complete this study and I appreciate them all. Some, however, deserve a special thanks.

First, I would like to thank Major Gail M. Casale, the Operations Officer at Army Broadcasting Service. Her assistance with the research for this study was invaluable. She exceeded my expectations with her help and guidance.

I would like to thank Dr. Harold Shaver of the W. Page Pitt School of Journalism and Mass Communications at Marshall University. His evaluations and guidance during the writing of this study kept me on track and held me to the fire to get it done.

I also would like to thank the rest of my thesis committee, Dr. Steven Banks, Dr. Corley Dennison and Professor Dwight Jensen, for their interest and assistance.

A special thanks goes to Dr. Robert Behrman and his wife Jane for their assistance with the statistics and the typing of this study, especially when I deleted it from the computer.

I appreciate the help of Steve Gady, Merv Brokke and John Suttle for their help on the computer and motivation to complete this study.

I am grateful to the commanders and production personnel of AFRTS who participated in the study.

Finally , I thank the soldiers of the United States Army with whom it has been my pleasure to work during my career in the Army. Your continued professionalism has inspired me to better myself.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Significance of the Study

Surveying the opinions held toward the Armed Forces Radio and Television Service (AFRTS) will achieve two goals. First, commanders will become more aware of the effectiveness of AFRTS as a command information tool by learning the views of other commanders and by showing how TV affects others' views of the U.S. Then commanders will be able to reach more of the target audience with their messages and thus keep them informed about relevant matters. The end result will be an increase in audience members' morale.

Second, those associated with the production of AFRTS will become more aware of the views of the commanders that use it. They can make the necessary changes to the network to make it more responsive when dealing with host nation natives and as part of the command information system.

Statement of Problem

With the deployment of U.S. troops throughout the world, the military has set up a radio and television network system that broadcasts U.S. entertainment and news programs, along with military information, to troops, their families and Department of Defense civilians. The network, the Armed Forces Radio and Television Service (AFRTS), shows U.S. programs in their entirety. This occurs despite the censorship laws of the host country where the troops are stationed. Natives of that country can tap into the broadcasts and see programs that may be censored by their government, causing problems between some host country governments and the United States government.

In 1977 the American Forces Korean Network, AFKN, began to broadcast programs in color. The Korean networks had not converted to

color yet and the Korean government, afraid that the population would watch AFKN more than the Korean networks because of the color, was able to get AFKN to reduce its color broadcasts (Putman 19). In the late 1970s AFKN negotiated with the Korean government to allow it to use satellite transmissions. In 1983 the Korean Ministry of Culture and Information wanted the agreement to include the clause, "AFKN will observe the domestic laws of Korea." Because AFKN refused, satellite transmissions were delayed (Putman 21).

The advent of satellite communications prompted AFKN to edit out reports from U.S. network newscasts that would violate host nation sensitivities. The U.S. networks complained. ABC's "World News Tonight" concluded the March 11, 1986 newscast with a challenge to AFKN to stop censoring newscasts and to air entire programs. AFKN then began the policy of dropping an entire newscast if it contained stories that offended host nation sensitivities (Putman 22).

Senior U.S. commanders stationed overseas, as part of ensuring that their tactical mission is met, must ensure that the morale of their troops is maintained and that the troops are kept informed. AFRTS makes this task easier by programming shows familiar to service members, thus extending U.S. culture into a foreign land. The commanders also have a quasi-diplomatic role to fulfill in building community relations. They must ensure that the U.S. government and the country are represented as accurately and as positively as possible. Their actions and the actions of their troops are how some of the host nation natives form their opinions of the U.S. and its people.

Therefore, the research question is: How effective is AFRTS for commanders in dealing with host nation natives and in keeping the troops in their command informed?

Purpose

AFRTS's target audience is the service members of the U.S. military, Department of Defense (DoD) civilians and the families of both groups stationed overseas. There is also a "shadow audience" made up of

the natives of the host nation. As Browne pointed out, AFRTS has always had a significant impact on the shadow audience, especially in its view of the U.S. and its people (Browne 38).

This research will survey brigade size unit commanders and above who are stationed overseas and the officers, non-commissioned officers and executive civilians in the United States who are associated with the production of AFRTS in order to find out if they have the same views as the commanders about the roles and effectiveness of AFRTS in the command information program and in dealings with the natives of the host country.

Hypotheses

The role and effects of AFRTS can easily lend themselves to hundreds of possible hypotheses. Six critical areas of concern have been identified and have led to the formulation of the following hypotheses.

H1. Commanders overseas will say AFRTS is a useful tool in keeping soldiers informed about world events, the United States and military policies and information affecting their unit.

H2. Commanders overseas who are light viewers of AFRTS will be less likely to see it as an asset in distributing information about the military, U.S. policy and international news than are commanders who are heavy viewers.

H3. Commanders overseas with two or more overseas assignments as a commander where AFRTS was available will be more likely to see AFRTS as an asset in accomplishing both their tactical and community relations building missions than are commanders with one overseas command experience.

H4. Commanders overseas will say that AFRTS-produced news is biased in favor of the military, the government and the host nation whereas U.S.

commercial network news shown on AFRTS is not.

H5. Commanders overseas will be more aware of the sensitivities of the host nation than the officers, non-commissioned officers and executive civilians in the U.S. associated with the production of AFRTS.

H6. Commanders overseas will be more likely than the officers, non-commissioned officers and executive civilians in the U.S. associated with the production of AFRTS to say that censorship of news critical of a host nation on AFRTS would make relations with the host nation easier.

Assumptions and Limitations

It is assumed that all commanders who are able to receive AFRTS television watch it. Also, it is assumed that commanders are involved in building stronger community relations with the local government and the host nation.

The validity of the survey's results is predicated on the presumption that all personnel surveyed will answer the survey questions based on their personal thoughts and not on how they think they should be answered.

Finally, no assumptions about the sample are necessary because the population will be surveyed.

The study has some limitations. Because it is not sanctioned by the military, the population has no obligation to answer and return it.

The survey is also limited because it does not address the population of the commanders of the other Armed Forces; the Navy, the Air Force, Coast Guard and the U.S. Marine Corps.

Finally, the study does not include the officers, the non-commissioned officers and the executive civilians associated in the production of AFRTS who are stationed outside of the United States. To include them would have meant that their commanders could have fallen into both categories of analysis, commanders overseas and personnel associated in the production of AFRTS.

CHAPTER 2

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Review of literature

History of AFRTS

The first military radio stations were credited to the inventive nature of U.S. military service members. Because there was no official government recognition of these stations, records are incomplete. The records that exist show that the first soldier-operated stations were in Panama and Alaska in the early days of World War II. General MacArthur's staff also set up stations on Bataan and Corregidor in the Philippines (AFRTS Fact Sheet: AFRTS 1).

The War Department first learned of the stations through movie actors and actresses who had been contacted by service members operating the stations. The service members wanted the actors to send them material for their programs, but because of security regulations, the material could not be sent. The actors then contacted the War Department (DoD 5120 5120.20-R C-1).

On May 26, 1942, the War Department officially established Armed Forces Radio Service (AFRS). AFRS's mission was to provide program services, shortwave programs and equipment for U.S. military locations overseas. It was also to give a "touch of home" to the service members and to counteract the influences of "Tokyo Rose" and "Axis Sally." A broadcasting executive, Thomas H. Lewis, was its first commander, and Los Angeles was chosen to be the base of AFRS because of its proximity to the entertainment industry (AFRTS Fact Sheet: AFRTS 1).

At the height of the war in 1945, about 300 AFRS stations were on the air, but by 1949 only 60 stations remained (DoD 5120 5120.20-R C-1).

Television became part of the service in 1953. It was introduced at Limestone Air Force Base, Maine. In 1954 AFRS changed its name to Armed Forces Radio and Television Service (AFRTS) (AFRTS Fact Sheet:

AFRTS 1).

During the Korean and Vietnam conflicts, AFRTS expanded its services in order to serve the combat forces in those conflicts (AFRTS Fact Sheet: AFRTS 1).

Color was added in the early 1970s. To show live sporting and news programs, satellites were first used in 1971. In 1988, satellite transmissions replaced AFRTS's shortwave system. Today, AFRTS uses eight satellites to provide worldwide coverage for U.S. service members and their families (AFRTS Fact Sheet: AFRTS 2).

Today, there are four Army networks within AFRTS. They are American Forces Network Europe (AFNE), American Forces Korean Network (AFKN), Southern Command Network (SCN) and Central Pacific Network (CPN). On October 1, 1993, Southern European Broadcasting was redesignated as an affiliate of AFNE. Together these networks give AFRTS worldwide coverage (DoD 5120 5120.20-R B-1).

As stated in Department of Defense regulation 5120.20-R, the mission of AFRTS is two-fold:

a) to provide U.S. military commanders overseas and at sea with sufficient electronic media resources to effectively communicate DoD, Service unique, theater, and local command information to personnel under their command, and b) to provide U.S. military members, DoD civilians, and their families stationed outside the continental United States (CONUS) with the same type and quality of American radio and television information and entertainment that would be available to them if they were in the CONUS (1-1).

AFRTS's programming is a composite of the most popular programs seen on American networks and cable channels. AFRTS in Los Angeles selects shows based on their performance in stateside ratings. The audience of AFRTS is also surveyed to see what shows they would like

added, dropped or moved. After the ratings are reviewed, the programming is then selected for the five networks that make up AFRTS (DoD 5120 5120.20-R 4-2).

As stated above, the target audience of AFRTS is U.S. service members, DoD civilians and both groups' families. This audience is accustomed to the type of programs shown and familiar with the political and economic ideologies and structures depicted in them.

A number of studies have shown that natives of other countries who watch U.S. programs can be influenced by them.

Television's Effects on Cultures

Gerbner and his colleagues have shown that heavy and light television viewing can influence the audience's perception of facts. Their cultivation hypothesis is the study of how the most recurrent features of the world of television affect a viewer's concepts of social reality. This perception, they argue, then influences the viewer's perception of society's norms, beliefs and culture ("Political Orientation" 107). Gerbner says that this influence brings a diverse society into agreement on opinions and beliefs. He calls this phenomenon "mainstreaming" ("Mainstreaming" 10).

Whereas Gerbner's studies were conducted in the United States, others have shown that "mainstreaming" also occurs in other countries. Morgan and Shanahan have shown that U.S. programming has affected the political attitudes of Argentinians, whose views of freedom of speech, authority and poverty were changed by U.S. television (Morgan 101).

A study in the Philippines revealed similar findings. Researchers found that U.S. television programs influenced not only natives' views of Filipino culture, but also their views of the U.S. and Americans ("Philippines" 69).

Even in societies that have a culture similar to the U.S.'s, American television has altered the natives' views of themselves and of the United States. Australians were influenced more by U.S. programs than by their own (Pingree and Hawkins 103).

The television view of Americans as depicted on U.S. programs has

helped to reinforce others' stereotypes of Americans. Tan and his associates found in their study that Mexicans and Taiwanese accept the images portrayed in programs as true. TV-influenced opinions resulted in stereotypical views of Americans even though their contact with Americans did not always reinforce these stereotypes ("Stereotypes" 813).

Kang and Morgan found similar results when they studied the impact that AFKN has had on the Korean culture. Their studies showed that heavy viewers of AFKN had non-traditional values for a Korean and a sharpened perception of the inadequacies of the American family system (Kang and Morgan 436).

The studies cited have shown that television influences countries' views of themselves, of the United States and of Americans.

Kane and Morgan's study shows AFRTS's programming influences other societies through its use of U.S. entertainment programs and news.

A number of studies have shown that natives of other countries who watch U.S. type newcasts can also be influenced by them.

A study by James Larson showed that television news influences foreign policy. Larson suggests that television news, though claiming to be unbiased, supports U.S. foreign policy (114). He claims that the sources for stories about U.S. foreign policy are usually administration officials who want to spread the administration's views. This and television's ability to transmit emotion-laden pictures can change the public's perception of foreign policy. Larson says this is emphasized by television news' failure to tell the background of the story and of the culture of the people that the story is about (113).

Robert Hackett's study of the Canadian Broadcasting Company (CBC) and Canadian Television (CTV) reinforced Larson's idea that television news only reports stories about other countries that are out of the ordinary and that usually cast that country in a bad light (824).

David Altheide argues in his study that the format of television news causes it to report only news that casts other countries in a bad light. He claims that it has short segments for stories that may require more depth analysis than people can easily and quickly comprehend (19).

The studies about the news and the U.S. type of programs and their

effects on other cultures, cited above, illustrate how other people can be given a false perception of the United States, the government and Americans. It is these types of programs that are shown on AFRTS.

One of the main differences between the programming on AFRTS and that seen on U.S. networks and cable channels is that there are no commercials on AFRTS. They are replaced by information spots. These are part of the command information portion of the mission of the network. They are usually produced by AFRTS and cover topics such as drug abuse, safety and security. The host nation's language may also be taught during these spots. (Stephen 39).

Another part of the command information system on the network is the locally produced news. Local Public Affairs Officers, PAOs, feed the network leads about events happening within their units. This is done in order to present a more favorable image of the unit and to keep service members informed. Locally produced stories can be transmitted by the SATNET satellite system to other AFRTS networks. These transmissions are done through Soldiers Radio and Television (SRTV)

To help ensure that AFRTS-produced programs maintain credibility, DoD Regulation 5120.20-R states:

The content, format, and presentation of local news programs shall be carefully supervised to ensure that such programming is factual, fair and unbiased (4-3).

The sensitivities of the host country are also addressed in AFRTS's programming. The senior military commander in the region, in cooperation with the U.S. embassy and its host-country team, will compile a list of items that are considered sensitive to the host nation where AFRTS is broadcast. The commanders and the host country team are the only ones who can add to or delete from that list (DoD Directive: AFRTS 3). At the same time these people will ensure that nothing stops the free flow of news and information in the style that the target audience knows (DoD 5120-R: Appendix F, AFRTS Program Materials F-1-8).

The host nation's sensitivities do not give AFRTS the right to censor programs. In fact, such action is strictly forbidden in DoD Regulation 5120.20-R. If a story does appear on a network newscast that is on a host nation's sensitivity list, then the entire program will be dropped and another network newscast will be inserted in its place. This way AFRTS still delivers the news and does not violate a country's sensitivity (DoD Directive: AFRTS 3).

These studies and policies indicate that AFRTS television, through its use of U.S. programming, may affect the way others view Americans, the U.S. government and the U.S. military. Some of the studies have shown these views are not always positive or realistic and may interfere with a commander's quasi diplomatic role.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Sources of Data

A mail survey questioned the entire population of 101 commanders of Army units, brigade size or larger, stationed overseas during the summer of 1993. It also surveyed the 49 officers, senior non-commissioned officers and civilian executives in the United States involved in the production of AFRTS.

The names of the overseas brigade or larger size unit commanders were requested through the various overseas command liaisons at the Pentagon. This population was selected because the brigade command is the point at which the commander begins to have a larger dual role of meeting not only the unit's tactical mission but also the mission of building community relations (Defense Information School 124).

The highest level of command to be surveyed is the Army level. An Army is assigned by a region. Its commander can be either a major general (two stars), a lieutenant general (three stars) or a general (four stars). There are four Army commanders included in this survey. They are the commanders of U.S. Army Europe, U.S. Army-Japan/IX corps, Eighth Army, Korea and U.S. Army South in Panama ("Command and Staff Directory" 193-195).

The next major level of command below an Army is a corps. A corps is usually commanded by a lieutenant general. The number of corps assigned to an Army varies. U.S. Army Europe has one corps, V Corps. U.S. Army Japan's corps, IX Corps, is combined with the Army's headquarters making the commander of U.S. Army Japan also the commander of IX Corps. Neither Eighth Army in Korea nor U.S. Army South in Panama has a corps in country ("Command and Staff Directory" 193-195).

A division is the next major command below the corps. It is usually commanded by a major general. There are two divisions in Europe, the

3rd Infantry and the 1st Armored. There are no divisions in either Japan or Panama. The 2nd Infantry Division is stationed in Korea under the Eighth Army ("Command and Staff Directory" 193-195).

The division usually has three or four brigades assigned to it. There is also a division Support Command within the division that is equivalent to a brigade in terms of command. Brigade commanders are usually the rank of colonel.

Overseas there are various other separate commands, which are brigades or regiments or medical centers not assigned to a division. Their commanders report either to a corps commander, or an Army commander. There are some special units like Army Material Command Europe and the U.S. Army Russian Institute that report to headquarters in the United States ("Command and Staff Directory" 193).

The AFRTS production personnel surveyed are all stationed in the United States. No one associated with AFRTS who is stationed overseas will be surveyed. This will ensure that the commander of an AFRTS unit overseas does not also fall into the commanders' category of analysis.

The 51 personnel to be surveyed were drawn from the World Wide Public Affairs Directory, the American Forces Information Service Key Personnel Locator, and the AFRTS Broadcast Center roster.

Executive civilians taking part in the survey include the government service rank of GS9 and above who do not serve in a clerical position such as secretary. Correspondents or technicians are not included in the survey.

Although their opinions and experiences are considered important, enlisted service members and civilians in GS eight positions and below who are assigned to the offices surveyed will not be included in the survey.

The Chief of Army Public Affairs, his deputy and Sergeant Major are included in the survey as are the Chief of Soldiers Radio and Television, along with his executive civilians and senior non-commissioned officer.

The officers assigned to Army Broadcasting Service (ABS) and AFRTS are also included.

Senior non-commissioned officers of all AFIS branches that include an officer who is being surveyed are included. The senior non-commissioned officers of each branch of ABS and AFRTS are also being surveyed.

Research Instruments

The data collection instrument was a mail survey. Two surveys were prepared, one for the overseas commanders and one for those in the United States associated with the production of AFRTS. The majority of the questions asked are identical in the two surveys. This reduces the number of questions to those in the U.S. who are associated with the production of AFRTS. The demographic questions, questions concerning command experiences with AFRTS and the type of news services used by commanders overseas differentiate the two questionnaires.

The 39-question survey sent to the overseas commanders is divided into two sections geared to answer the six hypotheses. Appendix A has an example of the commanders' survey.

The personnel associated in the stateside production of AFRTS received a 28-question survey. It, too, is broken down into two sections. An example of this survey is in Appendix B.

The survey takes about 10 minutes to complete. A notice card was mailed to the survey's population two weeks prior to the mailing of the survey to notify them that it was coming. Reminder cards were mailed one week after the survey was mailed. Stamped self-addressed envelopes were included with the survey.

A pilot test was given to eight Army officers assigned to Marshall University's W. Page Pitt School of Journalism and Mass Communications. This helped to refine the survey's wording and format prior to sending it to the population.

Section one of each survey elicited the demographic information about the respondent to include branch of service, duty position and experience. Section two covered the respondents' views of the effectiveness of AFRTS as part of the command information system and how it affects

host nation natives. It also asked how much they watch it and what they think of its quality.

Questions are predominantly Likert Scale. They use a range of 1 to 5 and are defined as follows:

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

There are also some completion questions and a few multiple-choice questions. These questions deal with the types of news services the commanders overseas use and their views of the effectiveness of AFRTS. These questions are incorporated into the demographics of the commanders.

There is a section at the end of the survey for the respondents to give their comments about the questions or the survey.

Treatment of Data

Three statistical procedures were used to analyze the data. The first procedure used was frequency and percentage distributions to graphically display the responses and to determine the strength of positive or negative responses. The respondents were profiled using the same technique. Pearson r was used to determine the relationship among the various independent and dependent variables, such as the correlation between experience and the effectiveness of AFRTS as part of the command information system. Finally, analysis of variance was used to test for significant differences among the independent variables.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Out of the 150 surveys mailed out on May 28, 1993, 101 were sent to brigade size or larger unit commanders overseas. Of those, 17 were returned due to address errors. Sixty-four surveys were returned by the deadline, June 30, 1993. The rate of return for the commanders was 76.1 percent.

Forty-nine surveys were sent to people associated with the production of AFRTS in the United States. Two were returned by people who said they were not qualified to answer it. Thirty-nine were returned by June 30, 1993 for a return rate of 79.5 percent.

For the entire population 102 surveys were returned out of 131 usable surveys for a return rate of 77.8 percent.

Survey data were analyzed by using Pearson r correlation. Each survey question was considered as a separate variable and then grouped into demographics and variables to support or reject the six hypotheses.

For the commanders, their experience as a commander overseas, time spent overseas, years of service, time in their current command position, their number of overseas assignments where AFRTS was available and the country of assignment were extracted for demographic purposes.

The commanders' country of assignment was also used to run an analysis of variance against the survey data to determine significant differences among commanders, according to country of assignment.

For the people associated with the production of AFRTS, their branch of service, how long they had been with the government, how long they had been in their current position and how many AFRTS assignments they have had were extracted to identify their demographic profile.

An analysis of variance was run to compare the commanders and the production personnel's views on the effectiveness of AFRTS.

The respondents' comments were reviewed for trends in perceived problem areas. This information will be used in the "Discussion."

Demographics

Commanders overseas

Overseas commanders who responded to the survey reported an average of over 23 years of service in the Army. Respondents' years in service ranged from eight (one respondent) to 36 (also one respondent). The largest group of respondents (17.2 percent) had 26 years in service.

The typical commander overseas who responded has been in the assigned country for 23.64 months. The longest a commander had been "in-country" was 48 months (three respondents) and the shortest amount of time was under one month (one respondent). Commanders who had been in country for 11 to 12 months was the largest percentage of commanders who returned the survey (23.4 percent).

Most commanders who returned the survey had been in command for 17.5 months. The longest a commander had been in command was 36 months (three respondents). The newest commanders had been in command less than one month (two respondents). The largest percentage of respondents have been in their current command position for 11 to 12 months (21.3 percent).

For most commanders, 24 of them, who completed the survey, this is their third overseas assignment, and all respondents had at least one previous overseas assignment. For five, this is their second assignment and two have been overseas eight times. Both who have had eight overseas assignments had a number of assignments in Vietnam. For 62.5 percent of the commanders, this is either their third or fourth overseas assignment.

Forty-two commanders have had either two (20 commanders) or three (22 commanders) overseas assignments where AFRTS television has been available (65.7 percent). Three respondents said that this is their first overseas assignment where AFRTS television was available.

Commanders who returned the survey were nearly evenly split between this being either their second (19 respondents) or their third (20 respondents) overseas command. These two groups represented 69.63 percentage of the respondents. For 14 commanders this was their first command overseas. Three commanders had had three previous overseas commands.

Thirty-four of the commanders who responded to the survey were in Germany, eight were from Japan, 13 from Korea, eight from Panama and one was from Honduras. In order to keep the respondents' identity confidential, the commanders from Honduras and Panama were placed in one group.

The comparisons among countries are needed because of the different ways that AFRTS is transmitted. In Japan AFRTS is transmitted only by cable. In Germany, Korea, Panama and Honduras it is transmitted by broadcast and cable. In the countries where it is transmitted by broadcast signals, it is more likely to be received by the host nation natives. The exception is Germany. Their reception for color television is by the PAL, Phase Alternate Line system, which is not compatible with the signals sent out by AFRTS. Japan, Korea, and Panama use the same color transmission system as AFRTS, the National Television System Committee system, but because the signal is sent by cable in Japan, there are very few Japanese who see it on a regular basis.

Tables 1a-1d represent the demographics of the commanders of each of the four groups of countries as compared to the average of all commanders who responded to the survey.

The commanders in Germany who returned the survey were 53.1 percent of the survey's respondents.

DEMOGRAPHICS OF COMMANDERS IN GERMANY

Table 1a

	Years of service	Months in country	Months in command	# of overseas assignments	# of assignments with AFRTS	# of overseas commands
Germany	24.6	26.3	15.5	4	3	2
Overall	23	23.6	17.5	3	2 or 3	2 or 3

As seen in Table 1a, comparison between the commanders in Germany and all of the commanders who responded to the survey indicates that the commanders there have more years in service, have spent more months in country and have had more overseas assignments than the average commander.

The commanders in Germany have also been in their commands fewer months than the average overseas commander. The average commander in Germany is typical of the overseas commander in the number of overseas assignments and in the number of assignments where AFRTS was available.

The commanders in Japan constituted 12.5 percent of the respondents for this study.

DEMOGRAPHICS OF COMMANDERS IN JAPAN

Table 1b

	Years of service	Months in country	Months in command	# of overseas assignments	# of assignments with AFRTS	# of overseas commands
Japan	19.75	13.6	13.6	2 or 3	2 or 3	1 or 2
Overall	23	23.6	17.5	3	2 or 3	2 or 3

The average commander in Japan, as compared to the other commanders that returned the survey, has fewer years of service and has spent fewer months in country and in command. Of special note here is that all commanders said that their number of months in country and in command were the same.

The average commander in Japan has had slightly fewer overseas commands and assignments but has had the same number of overseas assignments where AFRTS was available as compared to the rest of the overseas commanders.

The commanders in Korea who returned the survey were 20.3 percent of this study's respondents.

DEMOGRAPHICS OF COMMANDERS IN KOREA

Table 1c

	Years of service	Months in country	Months in command	# of overseas assignments	# of assignments with AFRTS	# of overseas commands
Korea	24.46	16.69	14.85	4 or 5	3 or 4	2 or 3
Overall	23	23.6	17.5	3	2 or 3	2 or 3

The typical commander in Korea has more years in service, more overseas assignments and slightly more overseas assignments where AFRTS was available as compared to the average commander. The average commander in Korea is similar to the other commanders in the number of overseas assignments they have had.

The commanders in Korea have fewer months in country and their months in command than the other commanders. All but one commander stated identical months in country and months in command. That one exception had been in Korea for 2 years before he assumed command. This explains why the average months in country is higher than the months in command average.

The commanders in Panama and Honduras, who returned the survey, constituted 14.1 percent of this study's respondents.

DEMOGRAPHICS OF COMMANDERS IN PANAMA/HONDURAS

Table 1d

	Years of service	Months in country	Months in command	# of overseas assignments	# of assignments with AFRTS	# of overseas commands
Panama	20.5	19	15.3	3 or 4	2 or 3	1 or 2
Overall	23	23.6	17.5	3	2 or 3	2 or 3

Commanders in Panama and Honduras, on average, have had slightly more overseas assignments in comparison with the other overseas

commanders. This is the only factor on which they exceed the average for all overseas commander respondents.

The commanders in Panama and Honduras were below the average for overseas commanders in years in service, months in country and in command. They were slightly below the average for overseas commanders for their number of overseas commands. They were like their other overseas compatriots in the number of assignments where AFRTS was available.

Overall the commanders overseas that responded to the survey have a wealth of experience in the Army, in being away from the continental United States and in command overseas. Their extensive overseas experiences show they know how to deal with host nation natives in a diplomatic manner while accomplishing both their tactical and support missions.

As part of accomplishing their assignments, commanders must know what and how to use the assets they have available to them. Because of that, it is presumed that they know the importance and ability that AFRTS has in helping them accomplish their mission.

Production personnel

As for the production personnel in the United States who responded to the survey, the majority of them, 21 or 55.3 percent, are DoD personnel.

Military personnel made up 42.1 percent of the survey's respondents. Twelve respondents, or 31.6 percent, checked that they are in the Army. The Air Force had 3 respondents for 7.9 percent. Only one respondent, 2.6 percent, indicated an assignment with the Navy.

Another respondent who checked "other" as to component of service, was not included in either the military or the DoD categories above, but the responses were included, when appropriate.

The mean number of years the production respondents had been either in the military or with the DoD was 23.44 years. One respondent had worked for the DoD for six years, the smallest number of years for either category. At the other end of the spectrum was a respondent who

had been in the DoD for 47 years.

The mean number of years production respondents had been in their position was 5.42 years. The extremes showed eight respondents who had been in their positions for one year and one respondent who had been in his current position for 22 years.

The production personnel who responded to the survey indicated that, on average, they had had 3 or 4 assignments with AFRTS. The extremes for this question showed eighteen in their first position and two who had 17 positions with AFRTS.

The production personnel who returned the survey typically have a wide variety of experiences with AFRTS and the military. It is therefore presumed they know the policies and procedures that AFRTS follows in its production procedures and what the audience of AFRTS wants and thinks about it.

AFRTS and the Command Information system

Commanders Overseas

Commanders overseas have a favorable opinion of the effectiveness of AFRTS television as part of the Command Information system. (Table 2a). As a group, they are inclined to agree with the questions about its effectiveness. A commander in Korea said that AFRTS television is great for morale and that it is essential to service members and their families' well being.

COMMANDERS' VIEWS OF AFRTS's EFFECTS ON COMMAND INFORMATION

Table 2a

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
<u>Quest. No. 7</u>			
Builds morale	64	1.859	.813

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
<u>Quest. No. 8</u> Helps			
Command Information	64	1.781	.518
<u>Quest. No. 9</u> Complements			
other Command Information	64	1.921	.673
<u>Quest. No. 10</u> Interferes			
with unit's mission	64	4.406	.77
<u>Quest. No. 11</u> Use it as			
part of Command Information	64	2.562	.833
<u>Quest. No. 12</u> Keeps personnel			
informed on DoD policies	64	2.093	.706

Note: The mean has a range from 1 to 5.

1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagrees

The 4.406 mean for question 10, "AFRTS television interferes with a unit's mission" indicates a negative response. This is because that question was worded negatively. This was to verify that respondents were not simply arbitrarily checking off their responses.

Question 11 also shows a slightly negative response. This indicates that commanders rarely use AFRTS television as part of their command information system. One respondent from Germany even stated that "commanders are poor when it comes to the use of AFRTS."

Three significant correlations between the demographics and the questions on table 2a emerged. The number of assignments a respondent has had where AFRTS television was available and his view on its effectiveness to complement the other forms of the command information system correlated at a statistically significant level ($r=.263$; $p<.035$). The commanders with more overseas assignments where AFRTS was available had a lower opinion of its ability to assist in the command information system.

The number of overseas assignments had a significant positive correlation with the view that AFRTS television interferes with a unit's mission ($r=.255$; $p<.041$). As the number of overseas assignments

increased, the idea that AFRTS television interfered with a unit's mission decreased. (It must be remembered that this question was worded negatively. Therefore the higher the mean, the more the respondent disagreed with the question.) This view is supported by the correlation between the years in service of the respondents and the same question ($r=.227$; $p<.035$).

An ANOVA was conducted to see if the commanders' demographic responses showed any significant differences among their responses on the effectiveness of AFRTS television. Two demographic questions showed a significant change in responses.

In relation to AFRTS's role in helping the command information system, there was a significant difference when the number of overseas assignments with AFRTS television availability is factored in ($F=5.48$; $p<.0002$).

The number of overseas assignments where AFRTS was available also caused different responses in the commanders' view that AFRTS complemented other forms of the command information system ($F=3.44$; $p<.0057$).

Question 10, about whether or not AFRTS TV interferes with a unit's mission, created statistically significant difference in the responses between the commanders in Germany and Japan, Japan and Korea and Korea and Panama/Honduras. Commanders in Germany and Korea were more likely to say that it did not interfere with a unit's mission than were the commanders in Japan. The commanders in Korea were also more likely to disagree with the question than the commanders in Panama/Honduras (Table 2b).

COUNTRY OF COMMANDER IN RELATION TO VIEWS ON AFRTS's EFFECTS ON A UNIT'S MISSION

Table 2b

	N	MEANS	PROBABILITY
Commanders in: Germany	34	4.529	
Japan	8	3.625	

	N	MEANS	PROBABILITY
Commanders in: Korea	13	4.769	
Panama/Honduras	9	4.000	
			P = .0016

Note: The mean has a range from 1 to 5.

1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagrees

An ANOVA was run to see if there were any significant differences between the questions above and the country the commanders were assigned to. Only question 10 showed a statistically significant difference between commanders when the country of assignment was the dependent variable.

Commanders in Germany, as compared to the commanders in Japan, were less likely to see AFRTS television as interfering with a unit's mission ($F=5.78$; $p<.0016$). Commanders in Korea are even less likely to see AFRTS television as interfering with a unit's mission as the commanders in Germany. There is a significant difference between them and the commanders in both Japan and Panama/Honduras. This becomes evident by reviewing the means on Table 2b.

Production personnel

The people in the United States who are associated with the production of AFRTS television have a very favorable opinion of its effectiveness (Table 2c). Their replies are consistently more favorable than those of the commanders. One respondent, in reference to questions eight and 10, said that there is too little input from commanders for AFRTS's command information mission to be as effective as it could be.

PRODUCTIONS' VIEWS OF AFRTS's EFFECTS ON COMMAND INFORMATION

Table 2c

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
<u>Quest. No. 7</u>			
Builds morale	38	1.552	.795 *
<u>Quest. No. 8</u> Helps			
Command Information	38	1.473	.603 **
<u>Quest. No. 9</u> Complements			
other Command Information	38	1.552	.554 **
<u>Quest. No. 10</u> Interferes			
with unit's mission	38	4.684	.525 #
<u>Quest. No. 11</u> Use it as			
part of Command Information	38	2.394	.916
<u>Quest. No. 12</u> Keeps personnel			
inform on DoD policies	38	1.657	.668 *

Note: The mean has a range from 1 to 5.

1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagrees

* There were no 5=Strongly Disagrees

** There were no 4=Disagrees or 5=Strongly Disagrees

There were no 1=Strongly Agrees or 2=Agrees

There were three significant correlations between the production personnel's demographic questions and the questions dealing with the effectiveness of AFRTS television. One of the correlations dealt with whether the respondent was in the military or with DoD. The other two involved the respondents' years in service to the DoD or the military.

The first significant correlation was between the respondent being in the military or with DoD and whether AFRTS television complemented other forms of the command information system. The military personnel did not feel as strongly as the DoD personnel that it did complement other

forms of the system ($r = .293$; $p < .073$).

As expected, a negative significant numerical correlation occurred between the production personnel's years in service and whether AFRTS television helps in the command information system ($r = -.285$; $p < .081$). As the years in service increased, the view that it does help the command information system increased.

This finding is supported by the other significant correlation dealing with years in service. A positive correlation developed between years in service for the production personnel and whether AFRTS interferes with a unit's mission ($r = .308$; $p < .059$). Since this question was worded negatively, as the respondents' years in service increased, so did the likelihood that they disagreed with the question that AFRTS television interfered with a unit's mission.

An ANOVA was performed on the responses from the production people to see if there were any significant differences between DoD personnel and military personnel associated with its production. There were none.

Comparison between commanders and production personnel

Table 2d compares the means between the commanders' responses and the production personnel's responses to the questions concerning AFRTS's effects on the command information system. As the table indicates, the commanders' responses consistently have a more favorable opinion of AFRTS's effects on the command information system than the production personnel.

The only exception is question 10, "AFRTS television interferes with a unit's mission." In this case the production personnel are less likely to agree with this statement.

**COMPARISON OF
COMMANDERS AND PRODUCTION PERSONNEL
ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF AFRTS
ON THE COMMAND INFORMATION SYSTEM**

	Table 2d	
	Commanders'	Production personnel's
	Mean	Mean
<u>Quest. No. 7</u>		
Builds morale	1.859	1.552 *
<u>Quest. No. 8</u> Helps		
Command Information	1.781	1.473 **
<u>Quest. No. 9</u> Complements		
other Command Information	1.921	1.552 **
<u>Quest. No. 10</u> Interferes		
with unit's mission	4.406	4.684 #
<u>Quest. No. 11</u> Use it as		
part of Command Information	2.562	2.394
<u>Quest. No. 12</u> Keeps personnel		
inform on DoD policies	2.093	1.657 *

Note: The mean has a range from 1 to 5.

1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagrees

* There were no 5=Strongly Disagrees

** There were no 1=Strongly Agrees

#There were no 1=Strongly Agrees or 2=Agrees

Pearson r determined that there were three statistically significant correlations between the commanders' and the production personnel's responses to the questions in table 2d. Question 8, "AFRTS television helps the command information system." question 9, "AFRTS television complements other forms of the command information system." and question 12, "AFRTS keeps military personnel and their families informed

on DoD policies." all showed statistically significant correlations between the groups. These correlations are shown in table 2d.

The correlation for question 10, "AFRTS television interferes with a unit's mission." was very close to being statistically significant.

The correlations of questions 8, 9 and 12 and question 10 support the findings in table 2d that the commanders' responses consistently display a more favorable opinion of AFRTS's effects on the command information system than do those of production personnel (Table 2e).

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN COMMANDERS' AND PRODUCERS' RESPONSES TO AFRTS'S EFFECTS ON THE COMMAND INFORMATION SYSTEM

Table 2e

	r =	p <
<u>Quest. No. 8</u> Helps Command Information	-.2627	.0076
<u>Quest. No. 9</u> Complements other Command Information	-.2741	.0053
<u>Quest. No. 10</u> Interferes with unit's mission	.1929	.0520 *
<u>Quest. No. 12</u> Keeps personnel inform on DoD policies	-.2936	.0027

*to be statistically significant, r must be greater than .2 and p < .05.

AFRTS and the Host Nation

Commanders overseas

Overall the responses from overseas commanders did not vary greatly when they indicated how they thought AFRTS television affected

host nation natives and how best to control the effects. Their mean score answers are shown in table 3a.

COMMANDERS' VIEWS OF AFRTS AND THE HOST NATION

Table 3a

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
<u>Quest. No. 15</u> Host nation presented accurately	64	2.531	.712
<u>Quest. No. 16</u> AFRTS news biased for host nation	64	3.375	.845
<u>Quest. No. 17</u> Natives question scenes from AFRTS	64	3.234	.987
<u>Quest. No. 18</u> Conflicts caused by programming	64	3.859	.709 **
<u>Quest. No. 19</u> AFRTS influences host's media	64	3.453	.974
<u>Quest. No. 20</u> AFRTS influences host's customs	64	3.546	1.053
<u>Quest. No. 21</u> AFRTS influences host's behavior	64	3.578	.988
<u>Quest. No. 22</u> Hosts believe AFRTS characters accurate	63	2.761	.817
<u>Quest. No. 23</u> AFRTS does not cause conflicts	64	2.359	.651 *
<u>Quest. No. 25</u> Censor programming against sensitivities	64	3.609	1.19
<u>Quest. No. 26</u> Show news showing host in bad light	64	1.718	.765 *

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Quest. No. 29 Confused			
by programs and military	64	3.468	.641 **

Note: The mean has a range from 1 to 5.

1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagrees

* There were no 5=Strongly Disagrees

** There were no 1=Strongly Agrees

There were four significant correlations between the demographics of the commanders and the questions dealing with AFRTS television's effects on the natives of the host nation. As a respondent spent more time in command, he was more likely to agree that host nation natives question commanders about events they see on AFRTS television ($r=-2.66$; $p<.033$).

Commanders who had more assignments where AFRTS television was available were less likely to agree that "U.S. network news should be shown in its entirety even if there is news that presents the host nation in a bad light ($r=-.303$; $p<.014$). That view is supported, but not to such a degree, when the commanders' months in country are correlated to the same question ($r=-.269$; $p<.031$).

Another significant correlation exists between commanders who had more assignments where AFRTS television was available and their views on censorship due to host nation sensitivities, question 25. A positive numerical correlation indicates that the longer a commander stays in country the less likely he is to agree that "programming that goes against a host nation's sensitivities should be censored ($r=.265$; $p<.033$)."

An ANOVA was run to compare the commanders' answers to the questions listed on table 3a. There were no significant differences.

Production personnel

The views of the production personnel were, as expected, negative when it came to AFRTS's effects on host nation natives. Table 3b shows

this pattern.

PRODUCERS' VIEWS OF AFRTS AND THE HOST NATION

Table 3b

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
<u>Quest. No. 15</u> Host nation presented accurately	38	2.657	.937
<u>Quest. No. 16</u> AFRTS news biased for host nation	38	3.868	1.094 **
<u>Quest. No. 17</u> Natives question scenes from AFRTS	38	2.789	.905
<u>Quest. No. 18</u> Conflicts caused by programming	38	3.71	1.063
<u>Quest. No. 19</u> AFRTS influences host's media	38	3.368	.882 **
<u>Quest. No. 20</u> AFRTS influences host's customs	38	3.71	.802 **
<u>Quest. No. 21</u> AFRTS influences host's behavior	38	3.605	.886 **
<u>Quest. No. 22</u> Hosts believe AFRTS characters accurate	38	2.763	.786 **
<u>Quest. No. 23</u> AFRTS does not cause conflicts	38	2.315	.774 *
<u>Quest. No. 25</u> Censor programming against sensitivities	37	3.729	1.239 **
<u>Quest. No. 26</u> Show news showing host in bad light	37	1.81	.775 *

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Quest. No. 29 Confused by programs and military	37	3.729	.961 **

Note: The mean has a range from 1 to 5.

1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagrees

* There were no 5=Strongly Disagrees

** There were no 1=Strongly Agrees

There were no correlations between the production personnel's demographic responses and the questions on table 3b.

An ANOVA was run to see if the demographics of the production personnel caused any significant differences in the rest of the responses. They did not.

Comparison between commanders and production personnel

Table 3c compares the mean score of the commanders' and the production personnel on questions about AFRTS's effects on the host nation.

COMPARISON OF COMMANDERS' AND PRODUCTION PERSONNEL'S VIEWS OF AFRTS AND THE HOST NATION

	Table 3c	
	Commanders' Mean	Production personnel's Mean
Quest. No. 15 Host nation presented accurately	2.531	2.657
Quest. No. 16 AFRTS news biased for host nation	3.375	3.868 **

	Commanders' mean	Production personnel's mean
<u>Quest. No. 17</u> Natives question scenes from AFRTS	3.234	2.786
<u>Quest. No. 18</u> Conflicts caused by programming	3.859 **	3.71
<u>Quest. No. 19</u> AFRTS influences host's media	3.453	3.368 **
<u>Quest. No. 20</u> AFRTS influences host's customs	3.546	3.71
<u>Quest. No. 21</u> AFRTS influences host's behavior	3.578	3.605 **
<u>Quest. No. 22</u> Hosts believe AFRTS characters accurate	2.761	2.763 **
<u>Quest. No. 23</u> AFRTS does not cause conflicts	2.359 *	2.315 *
<u>Quest. No. 25</u> Censor programming against sensitivities	3.609	3.729 **
<u>Quest. No. 26</u> Show news showing host in bad light	1.718 *	1.81 *
<u>Quest. No. 29</u> Confused by programs and military	3.468 **	3.729 **

Note: The mean has a range from 1 to 5.

1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagrees

* There were no 5=Strongly Disagrees

** There were no 1=Strongly Agrees

Comparing the means indicates that the commander's responses and the production personnels' responses are very similar for each question. The largest difference between the means, .493, was for question 16, "AFRTS-generated news is biased in favor of the host nation." The commanders were more likely to agree with the question than the

production personnel.

Pearson r determined that questions 16 and 17 had statistically significant correlations between the commanders' and the production personnel's responses (Table 3d). These correlations support the findings of table 3c for these two questions.

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN COMMANDERS' AND PRODUCERS' RESPONSES TO AFRTS'S EFFECTS ON THE HOST NATION

Table 3d

	$r=$	$p<$
<u>Quest. No. 16</u> AFRTS news biased for host nation	.247	.0123
<u>Quest. No. 17</u> Natives question scenes from AFRTS	-.2211	.0255

Accuracy of AFRTS

Commanders overseas

The questions that dealt with the accuracy of AFRTS caused a variety of responses from the overseas commanders but the responses tended to be on the "disagree" side of the scale. The pattern of their responses is seen in table 4a.

COMMANDERS' VIEWS ON THE ACCURACY OF AFRTS

Table 4a

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
<u>Quest. No. 13</u> Programs depict U.S. life	64	3.093	1.094
<u>Quest. No. 14</u> Positive image of U.S.	64	2.45	.815

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Quest. No. 24 Reflects			
U.S. programming	64	2.625	1.031
Quest. No. 27 Shouldn't			
show U.S. in a bad light	64	4.015	.967
Quest. No. 28 AFRTS news			
biased in favor of U.S.	64	2.82	1.189

Note: The mean has a range from 1 to 5.

1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagrees

Two significant correlations between commanders' demographics and their answers to the five questions about accuracy were found. Both dealt with question 24, "AFRTS television reflects television programming seen in the U.S."

There was a negative correlation between the number of overseas assignments where AFRTS television was available and the respondents' view that it reflected television programming seen in the U.S. ($r = -.265$; $p < .034$). This means that as the assignments where AFRTS television was available increased, the respondents viewed it as being more like U.S. television programming.

As for the number of months the respondents said they were in country, a negative correlation also developed in reference to AFRTS programming reflecting U.S. programming ($r = -.288$; $p < .02$). In other words, the longer the respondent was in country, the more likely the respondent was to see AFRTS television programming as being like U.S. television programming.

An ANOVA indicated there were no significant differences between any of the questions on table 4a and overseas commanders' demographics.

Production personnel

The questions that dealt with the accuracy of AFRTS elicited responses similar to those of the commanders from the people in the U.S.

associated with the production of AFRTS. The pattern of their responses is presented in table 4b.

PRODUCERS' VIEWS ON THE ACCURACY OF AFRTS

Table 4b

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
<u>Quest. No. 13</u> Programs			
depict U.S. life	37	2.81	1.075
<u>Quest. No. 14</u> Positive			
image of U.S.	37	2.459	.93 *
<u>Quest. No. 24</u> Reflects			
U.S. programming	38	1.815	1.009
<u>Quest. No. 27</u> Shouldn't			
show U.S. in a bad light	37	4.594	.643 **
<u>Quest. No. 28</u> AFRTS news			
biased in favor of U.S.	37	3.594	1.383

Note: The mean has a range from 1 to 5.

1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagrees

* There were no 5=Strongly Disagrees

** There were no 1=Strongly Agrees

There were no significant correlations between the demographics of the production people's responses and the questions dealing with the accuracy of AFRTS's programming. The same was true for an ANOVA between the same questions.

Comparison between commanders and production personnel

Table 4c compares the means between the commanders' responses and the production personnel's responses to the questions about the

accuracy of AFRTS.

COMPARISON OF COMMANDERS' AND PRODUCERS' RESPONSES ON THE ACCURACY OF AFRTS

		Table 4c	
		Commanders'	Production personnel's
		Mean	Mean
<u>Quest. No. 13</u>	Programs		
	depict U.S. life	3.093	2.81
<u>Quest. No. 14</u>	Positive		
	image of U.S.	2.45	2.459 *
<u>Quest. No. 24</u>	Reflects		
	U.S. programming	2.625	1.815
<u>Quest. No. 27</u>	Shouldn't		
	show U.S. in a bad light	4.015	4.594 **
<u>Quest. No. 28</u>	AFRTS news		
	biased in favor of U.S.	2.82	3.594

Note: The mean has a range from 1 to 5.

1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagrees

* There were no 5=Strongly Disagrees

** There were no 1=Strongly Agrees

The means for the commanders and the production personnel are fairly similar. The biggest difference, .81, occurred for question 24, "AFRTS television reflects television programming seen in the U.S." The production personnel were more likely to agree with this question than the commanders.

The commanders' responses for question 28, "AFRTS-generated news is biased in favor of the U.S. military," indicated they are more inclined to agree with it than are production personnel. The means differed by .774.

Pearson r determined that questions 24, 27 and 28 had statistically significant correlations between the commanders' and the production personnel's responses. These correlations support the findings of table 4c for these three questions.

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN COMMANDERS' AND PRODUCERS' RESPONSES TO THE ACCURACY OF AFRTS

Table 4d

	$r =$	$p <$
<u>Quest. No. 24</u> Reflects U.S. programming	-.3602	.0002
<u>Quest. No. 27</u> Shouldn't show U.S. in a bad light	.31	.0016
<u>Quest. No. 28</u> AFRTS news biased in favor of U.S.	.2831	.0041

Commanders' sources of news

The last two pages of the commanders' survey dealt with questions concerning their sources of news. Pearson r and an ANOVA were run on these questions as they related to the rest of the survey. Except for the question about the commanders' location, question 37, there were no other statistically significant findings (See Appendix G).

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

This study has two purposes. One of the purposes is to make commanders overseas more aware of the benefits that AFRTS television can have for their command information system.

The second purpose of this study is to make the production personnel of AFRTS more aware of how AFRTS television is viewed by the commanders.

By informing both of these groups of how AFRTS television can be a benefit to commanders overseas, it is hoped that changes can be made by both the commanders and the production personnel in order to make it a better product.

The findings, in general, are positive regarding the effectiveness of AFRTS television. Both the commanders and the production personnel have similar views, and the differences found can be attributed to the differences in their areas of expertise.

Command Information

One of the primary missions of AFRTS television is to supplement the command information system. Even while trying to satisfy a very diverse audience, commanders overwhelmingly agree that AFRTS television helps the command information system.

Hypothesis 1, "Commanders overseas will say AFRTS is a useful tool in keeping soldiers informed about world events, the U.S. and military policies and information affecting their unit," is clearly supported by tables 2a-c.

A trend that emerges from the data in those tables is that commanders with more time in the service have a better opinion of AFRTS as an asset in the command information system. Commanders in

Germany and Korea, who have more years of service than the average overseas commander, rated AFRTS television as being more of an asset than their counterparts with less years in service. A commander in his 28th year of service and stationed in Korea said, "AFRTS is great for morale of all military and U.S. citizens abroad. It is essential to our well being and that of our families. Keep it at all costs."

That comment, compared to a commander stationed in Panama with 18 years of service who said, "AFRTS is antiquated..." and "...should be contracted to civilian firms," tends to support the trend that commanders with more years in service have a better opinion of AFRTS as an asset in the command information system.

Hypothesis 2, "Commanders overseas who are light viewers of AFRTS are less likely to see it as an asset in distributing information about the military, U.S. policy and international news than commanders who are heavy viewers," could not be supported. Question 36, "Average hours per week you watch AFRTS television," had no statistically significant relationship with any of the questions dealing with the effectiveness of AFRTS as part of the command information system.

An interesting note to this hypothesis is that the commander in Panama who said AFRTS was antiquated watched it an average of one hour per day, while the commander in Korea who said it was great for morale, watched it an average of 3 hours per day.

Hypothesis 3, "Commanders overseas with two or more overseas assignments as a commander where AFRTS was available are more likely to see AFRTS as an asset in accomplishing both their tactical and community relations building missions as opposed to commanders with one overseas command experience," could not be supported. There were no statistically significant findings to verify this hypothesis.

A statistically significant correlation showed that commanders who have had more overseas assignments where AFRTS was available tended to view it as a stronger asset than commanders who have had fewer overseas assignments. One possible reason for the more positive view of commanders with more overseas experience is their belief that commanders do not use it as much as they should. Typical of these

commanders is a commander with four overseas assignments where AFRTS was available who said, "Most commanders are poor when it comes to use of AFRTS - little input..."

The view that commanders do not use AFRTS as part of their command information system enough is not lost on the production personnel. An Army service member serving with AFRTS with 24 years of service who works in AFRTS said "too little command input to AFRTS for command information assistance."

Effects on the Host Nation

AFRTS personnel attempt to balance their mission of serving effectively the military service members overseas and the command information system while not insulting a host nation's sensitivities. A commander in Korea said, "AFRTS has always done a pretty good job under difficult circumstances. You can't please everyone, and they (AFRTS) try to meet the needs of a pretty diverse group."

Tables 3a-d indicate hypothesis 5, "Commanders overseas are more aware of the sensitivities of the host nation than the officers, non-commissioned officers and executive civilians in the U.S. associated with the production of AFRTS," is not supported but the degree of rejection is weak. Most of the responses' means scores were closer to the neutral response than to any other response. Also, there were only slight differences between the two groups especially for questions 19-23, the questions that dealt with this hypothesis.

The largest difference between the means for questions 19-23 was for question 23, "AFRTS television does not cause conflicts between the host nation and the military." The commanders' mean was 2.359 and the production personnel's mean was 2.315. Both of these means are slightly above the neutral answer. They indicate that the production personnel, not the commanders, are more apt to agree with this statement. This indication is supported by a comment made by a civilian producer who said, "While incidents (natives questioning commanders about scenes from AFRTS) are seldom serious, AFRTS stations need to be sensitive to local

attitudes."

As for the question of AFRTS not presenting the host nation accurately, question 15, a commander in Germany said, "AFRTS can play a major role in Germany during drawdown and to get (the) real story behind neo-Nazi attitude against foreigners. I watch German newscasts and get a balanced report this way but if AFN-TV were the only news I received, I would not be fully informed."

A commander in Japan, who agreed with question 17, "Host nation natives question commanders about events they have seen on AFRTS television," and question 22, "Host nation natives believe the characters they see on AFRTS television to be accurate representations of typical Americans," said, "Violence and fashion glamour/sex on these shows (shows on AFRTS) is so persuasive that Asians who see AFRTS tend to feel the U.S. is full of violence and smut etc."

Concerning censorship and hypothesis 6, "Commanders overseas are more likely than the officers, non-commissioned officers and executive civilians in the U.S. associated with the production of AFRTS to say that censorship of news critical of a host nation on AFRTS would make relations with the host nation easier," the means for the commanders and the production personnel were closer to the neutral response (3.609), with the commanders slightly more in agreement with it (3.729).

A statistically significant correlation does exist between questions 18, "Programming on AFRTS causes conflict between the host nation natives and the U.S. military," and question 25, "Programming that goes against host nation sensitivities should be censored." ($r=.21309$; $p<.0324$). It has to be noted that the means for both of these questions was in the neutral zone; therefore, the commanders are not sure if AFRTS programming causes conflicts between the host nation and the U.S. military and if censorship is the way to control disrupting the host nation's sensitivities.

An Air Force producer explained the role of censorship by saying, "I put agree with (question 25) because censorship should be a last resort. However, host nation sensitivities are valid concerns and must be followed. News programs that put a nation in a bad light are pretty much

accepted in most, if not all, areas that AFRTS stations exist." He also added "... I think censorship is extremely rare within AFRTS."

Accuracy of AFRTS

Production personnel view AFRTS as accurately reflecting U.S. programming and to many commanders that is not such a good thing. Many of the commanders do not think that U.S. programming accurately reflects U.S. life. One commander in Korea who agreed that AFRTS reflects U.S. programming but who strongly disagreed that it depicted life in the U.S. said, "AFRTS reflects the exceedingly low standards of U.S. commercial television. Prime time is almost totally devoted to stupid sitcoms that are of no earthly value." He further states, "I am tired of being treated like a 78 IQ slob. AFRTS should not shuffle along in a mindless regurgitation of the worst of U.S. culture."

In the same light, a commander in Germany, who strongly disagreed that AFRTS programs depict life in the U.S. and who disagreed that its programming reflected U.S. television programming, said, "AFRTS shows the worst of the sitcoms."

In regard to the news on AFRTS, that same commander said, "Obvious liberal bias which comes from national news sources, CBS, CNN, etc. Needs to be balanced by Rush Limbaugh."

Both the commanders and the production personnel said AFRTS should not show only stories that show the U.S. in a good light. A commander in Panama said AFRTS news should "tell it like it is, especially to overseas folks."

The support for hypothesis 4, "Commanders overseas will say that AFRTS-produced news is biased in favor of the military, the government and the host nation whereas U.S. commercial network news shown on AFRTS is not," is reflected by the means to questions 13, 14, 15, 16 and 28 (Table 5).

AFRTS-GENERATED NEWS IS BIASED IN FAVOR OF U.S. MILITARY, GOVERNMENT AND HOST NATION

Table 5

	N	MEANS
<u>Quest. No. 13</u> Programs		
depict U.S. life	64	3.093
<u>Quest. No. 14</u> Positive		
image of U.S.	64	2.45
<u>Quest. No. 15</u> Host nation		
presented accurately	64	2.531
<u>Quest. No. 16</u> AFRTS news		
biased for host nation	64	3.375
<u>Quest. No. 28</u> AFRTS news		
biased in favor of U.S.	64	2.82

Note: The mean has a range from 1 to 5.

1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagrees

Hypothesis 4's support is mixed but is mostly neutral. Because of this the hypothesis is rejected. Even with this result, a typical commander who commented on the bias of AFRTS-produced news said, "Suggest they start to report some bad news as well."

A military production person with 17 years with AFRTS said, "Of course AFRTS-generated news is biased. We're an arm of Public Affairs." He also said, "I don't think we try to hide the fact that we do news biased for the military."

Summary

As shown by the data from the study, the difference between the commanders and the production personnel is very slight. They both see AFRTS as an asset to the command information system.

Commanders with more time in the service and overseas see AFRTS as a bigger asset than the commander with less time in service and time spent overseas. All commander and production personnel agree that commanders do not use AFRTS television enough and the data support this.

Both the commanders and the production personnel realize that AFRTS television can affect relationships with the host nation, but both also agree that the effects are slight. Both commanders and production personnel are neutral when it comes to AFRTS using censorship of stories to help ease the relations between the military and the host nation.

AFRTS is seen as reflecting U.S. television programming, but some respondents do not see this as a good thing. They believe that the programs do not reflect the United States and Americans on a whole in a realistic manner.

Overall AFRTS is accomplishing its mission to support the command information system while providing entertainment to the service members stationed overseas. It is up to the commanders to fully utilize this asset.

Future Study

This study attempted to look at the relation between the views of the Army's overseas commanders and the production personnel of AFRTS in the U.S. Some hypotheses were supported but most were not. Hopefully this will answer some questions of both groups as to why each side sees the same product differently. More importantly, though, this study may lead to a whole new set of questions.

AFRTS already conducts surveys to identify the audiences' viewing habits. This in itself is good, but other studies need to be done to test the effectiveness of AFRTS.

Future studies could compare the effects of AFRTS's command information mission by comparing the views of the commanders and the troops, who are the targets of the messages.

Studies could also be done to compare the differences among the

commanders of the different branches of the services as to how they view the effectiveness of AFRTS television.

Many respondents suggested that AFRTS television news is biased because it only reports good news, whether it be about the military, the host nation or the U.S. A future study could select one major story covered by AFRTS news teams, the national networks and the host nations' networks and see if there are differences in the way the story was covered, if there was a slant on the story and if the facts presented were the same in all stories.

Because AFRTS is a part of the command information system, programs should be produced so the audience will watch them. This seems to be the case now, but attitudes, tastes and technology are changing. Future studies need to be conducted to ensure that AFRTS stays in touch with what the audience wants.

APPENDIX A: Commanders' Survey

The purpose of this study is to determine the effectiveness of AFRTS as a command information tool and in relations with host nation natives.

In answering the questionnaire, please read each statement carefully and place your response in accordance with the instructions.

When you are completed, please return the questionnaire in the stamped, self-addressed envelope provided.

Please answer the following by filling in the blank below the question.

1. How many overseas assignments have you had?

2. How many overseas commands have you had?

3. How many years of service do you have ?
_____years
4. How long have you been in your current assignment?
_____months
5. How many overseas assignments have you had where AFRTS television was available?

6. How long have you been in the country where you are assigned?
_____months

Please use the following numerical code to answer the questions below.
Circle your answer.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree				
1	2	3	4	5				
7.	AFRTS television helps building troop moral.			1	2	3	4	5
8.	AFRTS television helps the command information system.			1	2	3	4	5
9.	AFRTS television complements other forms of the command information system.			1	2	3	4	5
10.	AFRTS television interferes with a unit's mission.			1	2	3	4	5
11.	Commanders use AFRTS television in their command information system.			1	2	3	4	5
12.	AFRTS keeps military personnel and their families informed on DoD policies.			1	2	3	4	5
13.	AFRTS television programs accurately depict life in the United States.			1	2	3	4	5
14.	AFRTS television projects a positive image of the United States.			1	2	3	4	5
15.	AFRTS presents the host nation accurately.			1	2	3	4	5
16.	AFRTS-generated news is biased in favor of the host nation.			1	2	3	4	5

Please use the following numerical code to answer the questions below.
Circle your answer.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17. | Host nation natives question commanders about events they have seen on AFRTS television. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. | Programming on AFRTS causes conflict between the host nation natives and the U.S. military. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. | AFRTS television influences the host nation's customs. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. | AFRTS television influences the host natives of the host nation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22. | Host nation natives believe the characters they see on AFRTS television to be accurate representations of typical Americans. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. | AFRTS television does not cause conflicts between the host nation and the military. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24. | AFRTS television reflects television programming seen in the U.S. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Please use the following numerical code to answer the questions below.
Circle your answer.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 25. | Programming that goes against host nation sensitivities should be censored. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 26. | U.S. network news programs should be shown in their entirety even if there is news that presents the host nation in a bad light. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 27. | AFRTS should not show news that puts the U.S. in a bad light. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 28. | AFRTS-generated news is biased in favor of the U.S. military. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 29. | Programs seen on AFRTS television confuse host nation natives between what they see on it and what they see U.S. military personnel do. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Please circle your answer to the following questions.

30. I have been involved with reports seen on AFRTS television.

Yes No

31. When do you watch AFRTS television?

Weekdays Weekends I do not watch it.

32. What part of the day do you watch AFRTS television?

Morning Afternoon Evening Does not apply.

33. How satisfied are you with AFRTS television programming?

Extremely Satisfied Very Somewhat Not Very

Not at all Does not apply.

34. How often do you watch the AFRTS generated newscast?

Always Often Sometimes Rarely Never

35. Overall how do you rate the AFRTS television news and information programming?

Excellent Good Fair Poor Very Poor

Does not apply

Please fill in your answer in the space provided.

36. Average hours per week you watch AFRTS television.

37. What country are you stationed?

38. What are your top three sources of information and news?

- | | | |
|----------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| 1. AFRTS television | 2. AFRTS radio | 3. Host country radio |
| 4. Host country television | 5. <u>Stars and Stripes</u> | 6. Word of mouth |
| 7. Other newspaper | 8. Other international satellite service | |
| 9. Bulletin Board | 10. Other | |

Number 1 source_____

Number 2 source_____

Number 3 source_____

39. What do you think about the amount of time on AFRTS television news casts for each of the categories below?

Too Much Just Right Not Enough

Host Nation			
Local Military Community			
U.S.			

THANK-YOU

Please return this questionnaire before 30 June, 1993.

Please write your comments below about any part of this questionnaire.
Reference the question you are commenting on.

APPENDIX B: Producers' Survey

The purpose of this study is to determine the effectiveness of AFRTS as a command information tool and in relations with host nation natives.

In answering the questionnaire, please read each statement carefully and place your response in accordance with the instructions.

When you are completed, please return the questionnaire in the stamped, self-addressed envelope provided.

Please circle your answer to the following questions.

1. What component of the DoD do you serve in?
DoD Army Air Force Navy U.S. Marine Corps Other
2. Are you military or civilian?
Military Civilian

Please answer the following by filling in the blank below the question.

3. How long have you been in the service/DoD?
_____years
4. How long have you been in your current assignment?
_____years
5. How many AFRTS assignments have you had since being employed by the government?
_____assignments

Please use the following numerical code to answer the questions below.
Circle your answer.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	1	2	3	4	5
6. AFRTS television helps build troop morale.	1	2	3	4	5
7. AFRTS television helps the command information system.	1	2	3	4	5
8. AFRTS television complements other forms of the command information system.	1	2	3	4	5
9. AFRTS television interferes with a unit's mission.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Commanders use AFRTS television in their command information system.	1	2	3	4	5
11. AFRTS keeps military personnel and their families informed on DoD policies.	1	2	3	4	5
12. AFRTS television programs accurately depict life in the United States.	1	2	3	4	5
13. AFRTS television projects a positive image of the United States.	1	2	3	4	5
14. AFRTS presents the host nation accurately.	1	2	3	4	5
15. AFRTS-generated news is biased in favor of the host nation.	1	2	3	4	5

Please use the following numerical code to answer the questions below.
Circle your answer.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	1	2	3	4	5
16. Host nation natives question commanders about events they have seen on AFRTS television.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Programming on AFRTS causes conflict between the host nation natives and the U.S. military.	1	2	3	4	5
18. AFRTS television influences the host nation's media.	1	2	3	4	5
19. AFRTS television influences the host nation's customs.	1	2	3	4	5
20. AFRTS influences the behavior of the natives of the host nation.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Host nation natives believe the characters they see on AFRTS television to be accurate representations of typical Americans.	1	2	3	4	5
22. AFRTS television does not cause conflicts between the host nation and the military.	1	2	3	4	5
23. AFRTS television reflects television programming seen in the U.S.	1	2	3	4	5

Please use the following numerical code to answer the questions below.
Circle your answer.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

24. Programming that goes against host nation sensitivities should be censored. 1 2 3 4 5
25. U.S. network news programs should be shown in their entirety even if there is news that presents the host nation in a bad light. 1 2 3 4 5
26. AFRTS should not show news that puts the U.S. in a bad light. 1 2 3 4 5
27. AFRTS-generated news is biased in favor of the U.S. military. 1 2 3 4 5
28. Programs seen on AFRTS television confuse host nation natives between what they see on it and what they see U.S. military personnel do. 1 2 3 4 5

THANK-YOU

Please return this questionnaire before 30 June, 1993.

Please write your comments below about any part of this questionnaire.
Reference the question you are commenting on.

APPENDIX C: Cover Letter for Surveys

May 28, 1993

SUBJECT: Survey for Master's Thesis on Effectiveness of AFRTS

1. I am Captain Thomas D. McCollum, an army captain who is attending Marshall University in Huntington, West Virginia as part of my FA 46, Public Affairs, training. I am asking for your help and views in conducting a survey as part of my thesis. Enclosed is a questionnaire. It should take no more than 10 minutes to answer. Please complete it and return it in the stamped self-addressed envelope provided by 30 June, 1993. All surveys will be confidential and individual responses will not be identified.

2. Although this survey is being conducted with the knowledge of the Office of the Chief of Public Affairs, this is a completely independent survey.

3. The goal of the thesis is to find out how effective AFRTS television is as part of the command information system. The thesis also addresses the possible problems AFRTS programming may cause in dealing with the host nation. It is hoped that the end product will be a benefit to you and the rest of the Armed Forces.

4. Thank you for your cooperation.

THOMAS D. McCollum
CPT (P) SF

P.O. Box 2425
Huntington, WV 25725

(304) 525-6242

APPENDIX D: Notice Card

A survey on the effectiveness of AFRTS television will be sent to you in about one week. It is part of a thesis I am doing for my FA 46, Public Affairs, training at Marshall University in Huntington, West Virginia. When it arrives please complete it and return it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope that will accompany it. All surveys should be returned by 30 June, 1993.

Thank you for your cooperation.

THOMAS D. McCOLLUM
CPT SF

APPENDIX E: Reminder Card

This is a reminder to return the survey about the effectiveness of AFRTS television no later than 30 June, 1993. If you have already mailed the survey back, I thank you.

Your cooperation in this matter is greatly appreciated.

THOMAS D. McCOLLUM
CPT SF

APPENDIX F: Results for Commanders' Sources of News

Question:	N:	Mean:	Standard Deviation:	Possible # of responses
30. Been involved with AFRTS reports	64	1.2187	.4166	2
31. When ARTS is watched	64	3.0156	1.266	5
32. Time of day AFRTS is watched	62	3.4193	1.2085	7
33. How satisfied with AFRTS TV	64	3.1250	.8819	5
34. How often watch AFRTS-generated news	64	2.5625	.9063	5
35. Rate of AFRTS news and information	64	2.5937	1.0648	6
36. Average hours/week AFRTS watched	64	8.7500	7.0440	Open
37. Country stationed in	64	1.9687	1.1814	5
38. #1 source of news and information	64	4.9218	2.5715	10
39. #2 source of news and information	63	3.5714	2.5381	10
40. #3 source of news and information	61	4.1475	2.8097	10
41. Amount of time given to host nation	62	2.4354	.5616	3
42. Amount of time given to local military	62	2.0161	.5578	3
43. Amount of time given to U.S.	62	2.3870	.5826	3

The commanders' responses were numerically labeled for analytical purposes. The numerical correlation for the responses started with one and went up for each possible response. The correlation for most questions is fairly easy to follow. The responses to some questions must be explained.

Question 31 had four possible responses from the survey; 1=weekdays, 2=weekends, 3=I do not watch and 4=weekdays and weekends. A commander from Germany wrote in his response, "rarely." It was labeled 5.

Question 32 had seven possible responses; 1=morning, 2=afternoon, 3=evening, 4=Does not apply, 5=morning and afternoons, 6=afternoon and evening and 7= morning and evening.

Question 36 was an open-ended question.

Question 37 had five possible responses; 1=Germany, 2=Japan, 3=Korea, 4= Panama and 5=Honduras.

Question 38 on the survey was broken down into three questions for the numerical coding. The commanders' first source of news was labeled question 38. Their second source of news was labeled question 39 and their third source of news was labeled 40. All three questions had 10 possible responses.

Question 39 on the survey was also broken down into three questions for numerical coding. The commanders response on the amount of coverage on the host nation was question 41. Their response for the local military community was question 42, and their response on the amount of coverage on the U.S. was question 43. All three questions had three possible responses.

APPENDIX G: Commanders' comments about the questionnaire

The comments in this appendix were written by the commanders on the last page of their questionnaire. The comments are arranged by country and by the question they pertain to.

Comments that were general in nature are listed at the end of this appendix. Comments such as "good luck" were not included but they were appreciated.

Germany:

Question 11:

Most commanders are poor when it comes to use of AFRTS, little input, nearly full reliance on PA's and AFRTS staff.

Question 13:

AFRTS shows the worst of the sitcoms.

Question 15:

AFRTS can play a major role in Germany during drawdown and to get real story behind neo-Nazi attitude against foreigners. I watch Germany newscasts and get a balanced report this way but if AFN-TV (which I see only infrequently during the day) were the only news I received, I would not be fully informed. More working together with local German TV/radio would be helpful for both sides.

Question 24:

Obvious liberal bias which comes from national news sources, CBS, CNN, etc. Needs to be balanced by Rush Limbough.

Question 39:

Your question seems slanted toward idea that AFRTS stations just serve one community. That is rare. AFRTS now serves multiple communities and multiple nations.

General:

AFRTS does a pretty good job trying to satisfy the diverse desires of a very wide audience group.

Too repetitive on local military news.

The local military news shows and Air Force/Navy weekly shows are interesting, but continuously show the services in the best light. Suggest they start to report some on the bad news as well.

Need more national/CNN, less local rah, rah.

No questions on impact of DBS English language channels. Most places today have six to nine English language TV channels. AFRTS being just one of them.

Please realize that most "shadow" audiences in Europe are very small. Host nation audience has limited access to NTSC TV's and absolutely hate commercial breaks in TV programs.

AFRTS radio has little to offer that is not carried on Euro Radio.

Too much sports on AFRTS (flooded by seasonal sports at all hours, day and night).

Need more network news. CNN when seen is great.

Need "Oprah Show" five days a week (my wife's suggestion).

Timing of specials, such as 4th of July celebration in D.C., is bad (a.m. of 5 July).

They need to get more up to date sitcoms.

Having spent several years as a member of the AFRTS staff in several locations, I can say that overall the AFRTS mission is accomplished.

I have spent five tours and 15 years in Germany. AFRTS has gotten better each year. Live sports broadcasts have really improved. Helps maintain morale.

Repetitive amateur commercials are the bane of AFRTS.

I do not receive AFRTS TV at my home as I do not live in quarters. I monitor it in my office.

AFRTS radio (AFN-E) has an excellent morning (0600-0800) news broadcast that I try to listen to enroute to work daily.

Striper provides a good round out to what radio and TV provide.

German radio and TV provide excellent European and world coverage.

Japan:

General:

AFRTS has U.S. programming well represented for the "lowest common denominator" with lots of sports and popular shows. Violence and fashion glamour/sex on these shows is so pervasive that Asians who see AFRTS tend to feel the U.S. is full of violence and smut, etc. It has been of interest to me during two tours of Korea and here in Japan that the "natives" view U.S. (women) as sleazy and easy, much the same stereotype as some about Asians.

I am amazed at the porosity of programming related to cultural/historical features of the host nation. These shows should be a heavy percentage of the non-sports programming on AFRTS. They are available from PBS sources and cable sources (AFRTS does a mediocre job at best on "cultural features" it produces).

On Honshu, in Japan, AFRTS TV is via cable only, no broadcasts.

Therefore AM radio has a greater impact on host nation than TV.

On Okinawa, both TV and AM/FM radio are broadcast with equal effect.

General:

This survey is very much more applicable to Korea where TV transmission is over the air waves and local TV is less sophisticated than Japan's. Here FEN (Far East Network) is closed circuit and local Japanese TV is highly developed.

Also, here at Camp Zama and many other stations we get SAT NET, CNN, CNN Headline News, a movie channel, a "nostalgia" channel, and lots of Japanese TV English language programming. AFRTS has plenty of competition.

Panama/Honduras:

Question 13:

Not really because there aren't many "on the street" shows on AFN.

Question 24:

The shows are too old by the time we see them.

Question 25:

Living in a country that has been invaded by the U.S.

Question 27:

Tell it like it is, especially to overseas folks.

Question 28:

It should, AFRTS stands for Armed Forces Radio and Television Service.

General:

As you may know, XXXXXXXXX, has its own AFRTS station, TV and radio, and we use it to compliment our own cable system. We do not generate our own shows, but simply use satellite feed off other shows and tapes.

On the radio side, though, we do a lot of original stuff. We have a volunteer DJ program, a good news feed, and some pretty imaginative programming. Overall, I think we get more original, command information stuff from radio rather than TV.

AFRTS is antiquated and controlled by the local commander. It should be contracted to civilian firms.

Korea:

Question 24:

AFRTS reflects the exceedingly low standards of U.S. commercial television. Prime time is almost totally devoted to stupid sitcoms that are of no earthly value. What's wrong with promoting knowledge and education? Where is the great PBS programming? Why do we insist upon operating on the lowest common denominator principle. I am tired of being treated like a 78 IQ slob. AFRTS should not shuffle along in a mindless regurgitation of the worst of U.S. culture. AFRTS has achieved "wasteland" status. Thanks for the opportunity.

General:

AFRTS is great for morale of all military and U.S. citizens abroad. It is essential to our well being and that of our families. Keep it at all cost.

AFRTS has always done a pretty good job under difficult circumstances. You can't please everyone, and they try to meet the needs of a pretty diverse audience.

APPENDIX H: Producers' comments about the questionnaire

The comments in this appendix were written by the production personnel on the last page of their questionnaire. They are listed by the question they pertain to. Comments that were general in nature are listed at the end of this appendix.

Question 8:

(Also for question 10) Too little commander input to AFRTS for command information assistance.

Question 12:

AFRTS programs do accurately depict life in the United States as much as one channel can do that. Of course the fringe programs and a lot of cable type programming isn't on AFRTS.

(Also for questions 13 and 14) To the same extent that U.S. commercial television does.

(Also for question 13) Calling them "AFRTS television programs" is misleading, as AFRTS has no control over program content.

Question 16:

Not often. With two exceptions, Panama and Korea, most "natives" cannot receive television.

Question 17:

(Also for question 22) Same as 16, but it is usually officials not the average "native" citizens who complain that a program conflicts with the culture mores or history of the country. While incidents are seldom serious AFRTS stations need to be sensitive to local attitudes.

Question 23:

The mission of AFRTS television is to provide "the best of American television" i.e. commercial and public television programming.

Question 24:

This is a local official decision that must be made on a case by case basis.

Based on unified command-approved sensitivity list only.

Question 25:

I put agree because censorship should be the last resort. However, host nation sensitivities are vital concerns and must be followed. News programs that put a nation in a bad light are pretty much accepted in most, if not all, areas that AFRTS stations exist.

It is DoD policy that there be a free flow of news and information without censorship, propagandizing or manipulation. In all cases field stations have the responsibility to ensure that the country team policies and host nation sensitivities are considered.

Question 27:

Of course AFRTS-generated news is biased. We are an arm of Public Affairs. We are forbidden from doing investigative type journalism and report only the facts when a negative story surfaces. I do not think we try to hide the fact that we do news biased for the military. But remember, network news casts are never censored. However entire shows may be cut if the program contains host nation sensitivities. An exception is CNN, which does allow censorship/editing of segments of its newscast. Censorship is only done as a result of host nation sensitivities. In my 17 years of AFRTS, I've only seen one time where I felt there was censorship, and that was back in 1979/80 at AFKN. Otherwise I think censorship is extremely rare within AFRTS.

General:

There are two basic problems that make this survey of questionable validity:

1. Because we either broadcast in the NTSC format standard for TV and the host nation broadcasts TV in PAL or SECAM format standard or we are cable on-base and in family quarters and do not "broadcast" over the air, very, very few of the natives watch AFRTS-TV, i.e. our potential impact is minimal (most places no more than 2-3% of the population has access to our TV programming) and;

2. A significant number of U.S. television programs are broadcast by host nation stations and/or cable channels in the native language. If there is any influence by American TV programming of native customs and behavior towards the U.S., it is not from AFRTS broadcasts.

In many, if not most, locations AFRTS is not seen (TV) by the natives. Radio reaches a far larger audience and consequently has much more impact. Also, most countries have a different TV standard than the NTSC used by AFRTS which further reduces viewership.

Works Cited

- 1 Altheide, David L. "The Impact of Television News Formats on Social Policy." Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media 35, no. 1 (Winter, 1991).
- 2 Armed Forces Radio and Television Service, Fact Sheet: Armed Forces Radio and Television Service (AFRTS) (Washington: Department of Defense, 1993).
- 3 Armed Forces Radio and Television Service, Fact Sheet: Historical Summary: Armed Forces Radio and Television Service (AFRTS) (Washington: Department of Defense, 1993).
- 4 Browne, Donald R. "The World in the Pentagon's Shadow." Educational Broadcasting Review 5, no. 1 (February, 1971).
- 5 "Command and Staff Directory." Army, October, 1992.
- 6 Craig, R. Stephen. "The American Forces Network, Europe: A Case Study in Military Broadcasting." Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media 30, no. 1 (Winter, 1986).
- 7 Defense Information School. Public Affairs Handbook. Fort Benjamin Harrison: Defense Information School, 1991.
- 8 Department of Defense. The Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs). DoD 5 Appendix F. Armed Forces Radio and Television Service (AFRTS) Program Materials. Washington: Department of Defense, 1991.

- 9 Department of Defense. The Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs). DoD 5120 5120.20-R: Armed Forces Radio and Television Service (AFRTS) Program Materials. Washington: Department of Defense, 1988.
- 10 Department of Defense. The Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs). Directive: Armed Forces Radio and Television Service (AFRTS). Washington: Department of Defense, 1991.
- 11 Gerbner, George, Larry Gross, Michael Morgan, and Nancy Signorielli. "Charting the Mainstream: Television's Contributions to Political Orientations." Journal of Communication 32, no. 2 (Spring, 1982.)
- 12 Gerbner, George, Larry Gross, Michael Morgan, and Nancy Signorielli. "The 'Mainstreaming' of America: Violence Profile No. 11." Journal of Communication 30, no. 3 (Summer, 1980).
- 13 Hackett, Robert A. "Coups, Earthquakes and Hostages? Foreign News on Canadian Television." Canadian Journal of Political Science (December, 1989).
- 14 Kang, Jong Geun, and Michael Morgan. "Culture Clash: Impact of U.S. Television in Korea." Journalism Quarterly 65 (Summer, 1988).
- 15 Larson, James F. "Television and U.S. Foreign Policy: The Case of the Iran Hostage Crisis." Journal of Communication 36, no. 4 (Autumn, 1986).
- 16 Morgan, Michael. "Television and the Cultivation of Political Attitudes in Argentina." Journal of Communication 41, no. 1 (Winter, 1991).

- 17 Pingree, Suzanne, and Robert Hawkins. "U.S. Programs on Australian Television: The Cultivation Effect." Journal of Communication 31, no. 1 (Winter, 1981).
- 18 Putman, Robert. The Frontline Network: A History of the American Forces Korean Network. Washington; Department of Defense, 1992.
- 19 Tan, Alexis S., Sarrina Li, and Charles Simpson. "American TV and Social Stereotypes of Americans in Taiwan and Mexico." Journalism Quarterly 63 (Autumn, 1986).
- 20 Tan, Alexis S., Gerdean K. Tan, and Alma S. Tan. "American TV in the Philippines: A Test of Cultural Impact." Journalism Quarterly 64 (Winter, 1987).